

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-27, and 29-41 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 13, 16, 29, and 30 are currently amended. No new matter is introduced by virtue of the claim amendments. Support for amendments can be found, for example, in the published application in paragraph [0081], Figure 2, and associated text. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the claim amendments and remarks to follow is respectfully requested.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Examiner Basehoar is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on January 27, 2009. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. Cited art was discussed. No agreements were reached.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 13, 16-27, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although the term “tangibly” as used in conjunction with the claim term “computer readable medium” would seemingly preclude an interpretation of the claim scope to include “transmission media”, in the interest of cooperation and advancing prosecution, claims 13, 16, 29 and 30 have been amended to recite “computer readable storage medium” as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-25, 27, and 29-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the NPL reference W3C in view of Upton (US 7,152,204). Claims 11, 26 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over W3C in view of Upton and further in view of the NPL reference Schneider. It is respectfully submitted that at the very least, independent claims 1, 16 and 30 are patentable over W3C and Upton for at least the following reasons.

In particular, in the context of independent claims 1, 16 and 30, the combination of W3C and Upton does not disclose or suggest, e.g., *a one to one relationship between the service of the device or object and an XML document such that the service of the device or object is an instance of the abstract type if and only if the XML document is valid in accordance with the XML schema*, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 16 and 30.

The Office Action acknowledges (on page 4) that W3C does not specifically teach wherein said service is an instance of the abstract type if and only if the XML document is valid in accordance with the XML schema, but relies on Upton to cure the deficiencies of W3C in this regard. In particular, the Office Action cites Col. 15, lines 36-65 and Col. 16, lines 1-20 of Upton as disclosing an “isValid()” method for determining if an XML document is valid against an XML schema. However, it is respectfully submitted that reliance on Upton in combination of W3C is misplaced.

First of all, in the context of the claimed subject matter viewed as a whole, the general teaching of the “isValid()” method by Upton does not teach or suggest the claimed relation of the *one to one relationship between the service of the device or object and an XML document such that the service of the device or object is an instance of the abstract type if and only if the XML document is valid in accordance with the XML schema*. Indeed, Upton merely discloses validating a document against a schema, but does not disclose or suggest such “validation” as being associated with an IFF condition of when a *service of the device or object is an instance of the abstract type*, and where the abstract type is one that maps 1 to 1 with the corresponding XML schema. In short, neither Upton nor W3C specifically disclose or suggest the IFF condition as claimed.

Moreover, W3C discloses on page 13 that the XSD type system can be used to define types in a message regardless of ... whether the resulting XSD schema validates a particular wire

format. Therefore, given that W3C does not require validation, and given that Upton merely discloses validating a document against a schema, the combined teachings of W3C and Upton provide no motivation or suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art with regard to the claimed feature of *a one to one relationship between the service of the device or object and an XML document such that the service of the device or object is an instance of the abstract type if and only if the XML document is valid in accordance with the XML schema*, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 16 and 30.

Furthermore, with regard to claim 1, the combination of W3C and Upton does not disclose or suggest, e.g., *defining an interface description for an existing service of a device or object in a computing system, which describes a one to one mapping of each abstract type in the device or object to an XML schema type, wherein at least one abstract type is an abstraction of an existing first class concept of the existing service of the device or object*, as recited in claim 1. Similarly, with regard to claims 16 and 30, the combination of W3C and Upton does not disclose or suggest e.g., *a mapping mechanism for describing an existing service of one of a device and object in a computing system with an extensible markup language (XML)-based Interface Description Language (IDL) that one to one maps each type of a particular type-based system to an XML schema . . .*, as claimed.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 16 and 30 are allowable over the combination of W3C and Upton. Moreover, all pending claims that depend from claims 1, 16 and 30 are patentable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons given above for their respective base claims 1, 16 and 30, as well as for patentably distinct elements contained in such claims. It is to be noted that Applicants generally deny, and do not concede to, any statement, position or averment in the Office Action in support of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103, which is not specifically addressed by the foregoing arguments and response. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0736/183220.01
Application No.: 10/017,265
Office Action Dated: October 30, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that the present remarks are responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the official action, and respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: January 30, 2009

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439